



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,898	04/17/2000	Hirokazu Aoshima	ASA-878	1272
24956	7590	08/25/2004	EXAMINER	
MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C. 1800 DIAGONAL ROAD SUITE 370 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			BURGESS, BARBARA N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/550,898

Applicant(s)

AOSHIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Barbara N Burgess

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-12,14-43,45-47,49-51 and 53-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-12, 14-43, 45-47, 49-51, 53-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2157

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Amendments submitted on May 17, 2004. Claims 2 and 13 have been cancelled at the request of the Applicant. Claims 1, 3-12, 14-43, 45-47, 49-51, and 53-55 are presented for further examination

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 9-11, 12, 22-24, 25, 28-33, 41-43, 45-47, 49-51, 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duursma et al. (hereinafter "Duursma", US 2002/0103884 A1) in view of Levergood et al. (hereinafter "Levergood", 5,708,780).

As per claims 1, 9-10, 12, 22-23, 25, 28, 30-33, 41-43, 45-47, 49-51, 53-55, Duursma discloses an information distributing method of distributing information via a communication path to an information user unit from a first information providing resource and a second information providing resource, in said second information providing resource, said method comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2157

- Receiving a first request from the information user unit which has received first information from a first information providing resource (paragraphs [0046], [0047]);
- Transmitting a predetermined program code to the information user unit according to the first request (paragraphs [0046], [0047]);
- Receiving a second request from said information user unit, said second request requesting said second information providing resource to transmit second information quoted in the first information according to execution of the program code in said information user unit (paragraphs [0047], [0048], [0049]).

Duursma does not explicitly disclose:

- Determining in response to the second request whether or not the second request is allowed according to at least identifying information (URI) included in the second request;
- Information indicating a correspondence between an identifier code (ID) specifying second information for which quotation is allowed in the second information providing resource and an identifier of first information in the first information providing source;
- Identifying information (URI) identifying said first information;

However, the use and advantages for determining whether a request is allowed according to at least an identifying information (URI) and the URI identifying first information is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Levergood (column 3, lines 34-65, column 4, lines 10-19, 25-28,

Art Unit: 2157

column 5, lines 30-55, 63-65, column 6, lines 1-10, 21-25, 27-33, 37-40, 60-65, column 7, lines 15-20, 25-27, 38-46, column 8, lines 5-14).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate determining whether or not a request is allowed according to the URI and the URI identifying the first information in Duursma's method in order to identify if a client is allowed to have access to all controlled files within a protection domain.

As per claims 3, 14, 26, 35, Duursma further discloses wherein:

- The program code has a password (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]);
- Second request includes an identifier code to identify the second information to be quoted and the password (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]);
- Determining step further includes a step of collating the password in the second request received from the information user unit with a valid password (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]).

As per claims 4, 15, 17, and 36, Duursma discloses wherein the determining step allows:

- The identifier code to identify the second information is included in the database (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]).

As per claims 5, 16, and 37, Duursma further discloses including a step:

Art Unit: 2157

- Frequently changing a password in a program code to be sent to the information user unit (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]).

As per claims 11, 24, and 29, Duursma discloses:

- When the first information providing resource and the second information providing resource are implemented by a common server, said server distributes the first information via the communication path to a client as the information user unit and distributes, if the determining step allows the second request, the second information quoted in the first information to the client (paragraphs [0031], [0038], [0042], [0043]).

3. Claims 6-8, 18-21, 27, 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duursma et al. (hereinafter "Duursma", US 2002/0103884 A1) in view of Levergood et al. (hereinafter "Levergood", 5,708,780) and in further view of Savage.

As per claims 6, 8, 18, 20, 27, 38, and 40, Duursma, in view of Levergood, does not explicitly disclose wherein:

- Program code includes an encryption key to encrypt the second request;
- Second request includes information obtained by encrypting an identifier code to identify the second information according to the encryption key;
- The determining step further includes a step of verifying to determine whether or not the second request can be decoded;

Art Unit: 2157

- Frequently changing an encryption key in a program code to be sent to the information user unit

However, in an analogous art, Savage discloses the use of an encryption key (column 3, lines 32-54, column 5, lines 33-38, 65-67, column 6, lines 19-228, 41-46, 64-76).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate the use of an encryption key in Duursma's method so that third parties monitoring network traffic going to or coming from any of the servers in the system facility, either legally or illegally, are never able to connect an action taken by the server to the identity of a user who is connected to the server.

As per claims 7, 19 and 39, Duursma further discloses wherein the determining step allows:

- Second request when the second request can be decoded and the identifier code to identify the second information is included in the database (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]).

As per claim 21, Duursma further discloses:

- Including a database for storing therein a certain number of previous encryption keys and a current encryption key (paragraphs [0041]-[0043], [0048]).

Response to Arguments

The Office notes the following arguments:

- (a) Applicants request that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for priority and safe receipt of the certified priority document.
- (b) None of the cited references disclose that the URI is used to determine whether or not the second request for quoting the second information in the first information is allowed.
- (c) Levergood also fails to disclose or suggest that the second request for quoting second information in the first information is allowed based on the identifier (URI) of the primary information and the quotation allowance database.

In response to:

- (a) Examiner is submitting with this Office Action the PTO 326 form acknowledging receipt of certified priority papers as well as the claim for priority.
- (b)-(c) Both Duursma and Levergood discloses using the URI to determine whether the second request quoting second information in the first information is allowed and the allowance based on the URI and the allowance database. Duursma explicitly states "the application-related information for each application can be a variety of information including an address of the server hosting the application, the application name, the users or groups of users who are authorized to use that application...from the user credentials and the application-related information, the server can also determine which application programs hosted by the application servers are available for use by the user

Art Unit: 2157

of the client node.” According to Duursma, the user makes a request for an application via a master node. The master node responds and the user makes a second request to another server for the same application requested in the first request to the master node. Based on the user credentials and application-related information stored in the application database, a decision is made as to whether the request is allowed (paragraphs [0029, 0040, 0042, 0044, 0048, 0068-0072]).

Levergood further discloses a user requesting information from a content server. If the user is not authorized, the request is made to the authentication server. The authentication server issues a SID, which comprises a user identifier, an accessible domain, a key identifier, and the IP address of the user computer. Another request is then made requesting the original information along with the SID to the content server. The content server checks the validation of the SID and URL request before sending the requested document. An account database is used to determine whether a user is authorized. The database contains a user profile and SID (column 3, lines 21-23, 26-28, 33-65, column 4, lines 12-17, column 5, lines 30-56, column 6, lines 1-10, 20-25, 27-40, 58-67, column 7, lines 15-20).

Clearly, both references disclose the URI used to determine whether or not the second request for quoting the second information in the first information is allowed and allowance based on the identifier (URI) of the primary information and the quotation allowance database.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara N Burgess whose telephone number is (703) 305-3366. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/550,898
Art Unit: 2157

Page 10

Barbara N Burgess
Examiner
Art Unit 2157

August 20, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Saleh Najjar', with a stylized, cursive script.

SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER